



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

contrary, one cannot avoid the conclusion that if the "Reports" published in the Proceedings of the Society for Physical Research are to be accepted as science, the question of the desirability of immortality is decided in the negative. For surely the 'gibbering ghost' hypothesis of the psychical researchers belongs to the type of immortality which Mr. Dickinson would exclude as undesirable!

In discussing what kind of immortality is desirable, the author rejects 'eternal recurrence,' 'an immortality with hell,' and the positivistic conception of immortality. The conception of a continuation of an identical soul substance without any survival of consciousness—an hypothesis defended by Mr. McTaggart—does not seem to Mr. Dickinson so wholly unsatisfactory and unmeaning as it has to Mr. McTaggart's critics and as, I must confess, it does to me. An immortality which carried with it the continuance of self-consciousness would be, however, in Mr. Dickinson's opinion, much more desirable. For the development of the powers of the individual for good seems to require a continuity of experience analogous to that which we are aware of here; and it is only as rendering possible such a development that immortality is in the highest sense desirable and significant. "The whole strength of the case for immortality, as a thing to be desired, lies in the fact that no one in this life attains his ideal. . . . The conception that death ends all does not empty life of all its worth, but it destroys, in my judgment, its most precious element, that which transfigures all the rest; it obliterates the gleam on the snow, the planet in the east; it shuts off the great adventure, the adventure after death" (pp. 32, 33).

J. E. CREIGHTON.

Cornell University.

STUDIES IN MYSTICAL RELIGION. By Rufus M. Jones, M. A., D. Litt. London: Macmillan & Co., Ltd., 1909. Pp. xxxviii, 518.

A comprehensive, critical, and sympathetic treatment of mysticism is greatly needed. The comparative study of religion has brought together a vast amount of material elucidating the character and development of man's religious life.

There is already a number of excellent works describing, classifying, and attempting to explain the theological conceptions and ritualistic performances of various peoples in different ages. It is natural that the interest should at first have centered upon the ideas characteristic of each system, and that the significance of the cult should have found a more tardy recognition. This was no doubt due to the growing emphasis on the ethical content of religion. Just as the metaphysical element in the creeds seemed less important than the moral, acts designed to influence invisible spirits naturally appeared less valuable than acts expressing the relations of living men. Prophets and reformers appealed more strongly to the investigator than priests and augurs. At present, however, the interest among competent workers in this field is more equally divided between ritual and dogma.

But the scientific study of mysticism lags behind that of creed and cult. This phase of religious life is perhaps least understood and therefore apt to be discussed with most dogmatism. Ardent advocacy or relentless opposition is more frequently met than a calm and impartial estimate. The first demand of science is that, so far as possible, all material bearing on the subject should be collected and considered by the investigator. Most writers on mysticism deem it sufficient to seize upon a number of typical representatives; and the choice both of these and of their leading ideas is generally dictated by personal preference. Unless a student is something of a mystic himself, he is not likely to understand a mystic. But mystics, as a rule, are poor historians; they are seldom endowed with the critical judgment that is indispensable in dealing with documents of the past. A rare combination of wide and varied learning, critical acumen, and sympathetic insight is required of the historian of mysticism. Before the master-builder comes, there are many stones to be brought from the quarries and many designs to be submitted. Two of the most interesting and important contributions recently made are the work of Delacroix, "*Études d'histoire et de psychologie du mysticisme*" (Paris, 1908) and the present volume by Professor Jones.

The author possesses certain admirable qualifications for the task he has undertaken. He is in heartiest sympathy with his mystics; for he is a mystic himself and can speak of them as one who has shared their deepest experiences. At the same

time, his sturdy common sense, his strong attachment to a group of moral principles necessarily determining the conduct of life, and his comparatively slight interest in mystical speculation give a balance to his judgment not often found among mystics. His position allows him freedom to move beyond canonical boundaries and to estimate with fairness heretical movements. He has walked in some of the less trodden paths of ecclesiastical history. He writes with a modesty and freedom from assertion that are most commendable. He does not claim to present a complete history of mysticism. The purpose of his book is to be an introduction to a series of works by the author and others on the development of the Society of Friends. This should be borne in mind.

The first three chapters deal with early Christianity. Of these, the one on Montanism is a fine example of thoughtful appreciation and discriminating criticism. After a chapter on "Roots of Mysticism in Classical Literature," there follows a discussion of the Church Fathers, with special attention to Gregory of Nyssa and Augustine. Pseudo-Dionysius and Johannes Scotus Erigena are well treated; the Waldenses are described; a glowing tribute is paid to Francis of Assisi; Amaury, Ortlieb, and the pantheistical mystics are declared to "belong to the brave list of those who have grandly trusted the soul and who have helped, even at great risk and cost, to set it free"; the Beghards and Beguines are treated with discernment; and Eckhart is eulogized. With regard to Merswin and "the Friend of God from the Oberland" Professor Jones takes the ground that, while it is not possible to prove that Merswin wrote "The Banner of Christ" and "The Book of the Nine Rocks," he may have been known to Nicolaus, who enlarged these works as the author of some parts. No light is thrown upon John Tauler by "The Book of the Master of Holy Scripture," which is admitted to be a fiction. The author of "Theologia Germanica," Tauler, Ruysbroek, Gerhard Groote, Thomas à Kempis, Wyclif, the Lollards, the Anabaptists, the Familists, the Seekers, and the Ranters are discussed; sometimes, as in the case of the Anabaptists, with much historical detail.

In order to understand the author's principle of inclusion and exclusion, it is necessary to remember that he is primarily interested in describing the spiritual predecessors of the Friends.

Thus many movements of thought and life are introduced which do not represent mysticism so much as a practical opposition to sacerdotalism, sacramentalism, oath-taking, or retaliation. Professor Jones finds it necessary to make an excursion into paganism. He remarks with true insight: "The fact cannot be too often pressed that historical Christianity is a product of many movements, a religion woven out of many strands of faith and thought and practice." But was it wise to confine the attention to the Socratic school? When once the boundaries of Christianity had been crossed, why should not the "roots" of a religious mysticism, defined as "a direct and intimate consciousness of the divine presence" (p. xv), have been traced back at least to the great historic religions of Egypt, Syria, Babylonia, Persia, and India? Would it have been possible for the author to speak of Plato as "the father of speculative, as distinguished from simple, implicit, unreflective mysticism" (p. 58), or of "the tendency to treat the sense-world as unreal and shadowy" (p. 62), as beginning with Plato, if he had taken into consideration the development of thought in India? Philo of Alexandria is not mentioned in this work. Yet his influence upon mystical religion has certainly been far greater than that of Plotinus. The Egyptian substratum in the thought of the philosopher of Lycopolis is as unmistakable as the Jewish in Philo's speculation. Was there no "immediate awareness of relation with God" among the ancient Hebrews worthy of recording in this volume? And can the origin of mysticism be intelligently discussed without a reference to the 'mysteries'? A consideration of the Muslim and Jewish mystics of the Middle Ages would have been very valuable, and it is by no means certain that the modern type of religion in which the author is interested, has not drawn some of its life from these sources.

Within the pale of Christendom, one misses, in this book, above everything else, a fair and sympathetic treatment of the mystical religion that did not lead to outbreaks of heresy and schism. In fact, one almost gets the impression that all mystics worth mentioning were heretics. Yet there is always a mystical religion, deep and sincere, that lives and moves and has its being within the boundaries of orthodox faith and long-established customs. It breathes forth its aspirations in hymns and prayers and liturgies, processions, genuflexions, contemplation of images, sacraments and sacrifices, fasts and feasts and veneration of the

saints. No song has ever sung itself into the heart of man as that which was born of Christian dogma and of Christian ritual. What a wealth of mysticism there is in the hymns of Bernard of Clairvaux and in his Commentary on Canticles! What glowing warmth of religious feeling the paintings of the Madonna, the worship of the Virgin, and the prayers for the dead betray! There is a mysticism that attaches itself to, and feeds upon, the cult, just as there is a mysticism that detaches itself from, and becomes independent of, all ritual performances. The student of religion must learn to appreciate the great conservative forces as well as those that tend to vary the type.

The author's failure to mention so many mystics in Spain, Italy, and France of whom one naturally thinks, is probably occasioned by this negative attitude toward Latin Christianity. It would have been helpful in many ways to have had a presentation of the mystical religion of such thinkers as Alejo de Vanegas, Malon de Chaide, Diego de Estella, Juan de Avila, Luis de Granada, Luis de Leon, Teresa de Avila, and Miguel de Molinos; and of the Italians, Cardano, Telesio, Campanella, and Giordano Bruno. Madame de Guyon, Fénelon, and Jean de Labadie were profoundly influenced by Molinos, and in turn influenced Princess Elizabeth and Anna Maria Van Schuurmann with whom William Penn came in contact. A comparison of Bossuet and Fénelon would have been valuable. The picture of the Anabaptist movement would have been more complete, if the union of mysticism and rationalism in Hans Denck and in Tiziano and his friends at Vicenza had been set forth, and the religious life of David Joris had been analyzed. The introduction of a larger amount of material would have justified the exclusion of much historical material available elsewhere, and would have rendered it more possible to discern how far mysticism depends, for its characteristic life, upon a resolute following of 'the inner light,' regardless of the trammels of fixed dogma and the stimulus of established ritual. It would likewise have helped us to decide whether there is a necessary connection between the acceptance of this 'inner light,' as the supreme guide, and the attitude on certain moral questions, taken by Jesus of Nazareth, Francis of Assisi, some of the Anabaptists, the Quietists, and the Friends.

The author feels that there is a profound difference between the mysticism which, in his apt and striking phrase, "comes

home, with empty hands," and the mysticism which brings back from its heavenly journey reliable knowledge and impulses to noble living. Now, was there ever an eager spirit pushing "beyond the flaming walls of the world" who returned more empty-handed, so far as things metaphysical are concerned, than Gautama, the Buddha? Yet he most consistently taught and followed the principles of non-resistance and overcoming evil with good. Among Christian mystics there are those whose conception of ultimate reality is an absolute blank, without its involving any approach to Buddhist ethics, and others whose quietism is wedded to well-defined doctrines and prevalent modes of worship. The author of the Fourth Gospel is certainly more of a mystic than Jesus, whose career is singularly free from visions, ecstasies, mantic inspiration, and flights of philosophic speculation. There is no emphasis in this gospel on those principles of Jesus which the Friends have so nobly championed. When Professor Jones maintains that 'John' was less mystical than Paul, because he harked back to an objective experience, the vision of the life of Jesus and the listening to his words, he apparently still adheres to a view abandoned by critical students of the gospel. The man who wrote this wonderful work, probably between 135 and 140 A. D., certainly beheld, with the eyes of a mystic, the glory of the Logos, and heard, with the ears of a mystic, the metaphysical disquisitions that are so different from the words recorded by the Synoptists.

In a second edition, Professor Jones will, no doubt, revise the text so as to remove certain inconcinnities and infelicitous statements. On page 31 Ignatius is said to have died 110 A. D.; on page 501, *circa* 117. There is no evidence for either date. Page 77 closes the doors of the Academy at Athens 529 A. D.; page 78, 527 A. D. Did the Apostle of Ireland really come from Gaul (p. 115)? The statement that Samosata is "not far from the ancient Ur of the Chaldees" (p. 134) will not help anyone to find the home of Paul and Lucian. The distance being about six hundred miles, it would not be much worse to say, "Haverford, near Chicago." The little book that Luther edited does not bear the name "Theologica Germanica" (p. 291). To find "Theologische Studien und Kritiken," pp. 666-738 (so p. 223!), would take a good deal of a man's time. It should be 1839, pp. 663-744. Under the heading, "Rise of Anabaptism," in the Chronology (pp. 503 ff.), we find twenty-seven dates referring to

the life of Luther and six dates referring to the Anabaptists; under the heading, "Anabaptists in Great Britain," there are sixty-one dates, none of which seems to refer to the Anabaptists. If it is "Saint Columban," why should not the title be given to Columba (pp. 116, 501, 509)? Consistency would seem to demand either the omission of this title everywhere, or its use in the case of all such persons as have been duly canonized. The former practice would appear to an outsider as most in harmony with the principles of the Friends.

While a truly scientific treatment of mysticism is still a *desideratum*, the spirit in which this book is written and the information it contains cannot but prove profitable and cause the reader, interested in some of our most important ethical questions, to look with eagerness for the succeeding volumes of the series.

NATHANIEL SCHMIDT.

Cornell University.

NEOPLATONISM IN RELATION TO CHRISTIANITY. An Essay. By Charles Elsee, M. A. Cambridge: University Press, 1908. Pp. xii, 144.

Published as the expansion of a prize essay, this little work claims to be a contribution to the history of philosophical theology rather than of philosophy proper. The best parts of it are the accounts of writers like Origen, Synesius, and "Dionysius the Areopagite" among the Platonizing Christians, and of the author of the "De Mysteriis" on the pagan side. The important influence of Neoplatonism on Augustine is set forth at length; and the influence of the school on medieval thought is well brought out. In the exposition of the Neoplatonic doctrine itself, there is occasionally some want of exactitude. Plotinus is described (p. 55) as calling his first principle, among other names, Being (*τὸ ὄν*). Now the first principle, with Plotinus, is always said to be beyond being, which it produces. This is distinctly stated in one of the passages referred to in the footnote ("Ennead," II, 1). Again the author says: "Plotinus accepted in its entirety the Platonic doctrine of reminiscence, and the state of ecstasy is neither more nor less than the temporary realization of the longing which the spirit feels for its return into the world of Ideas" (pp. 58, 59). In reality, Plotinus